UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,608	06/28/2001	Ciprian Agapi	6169-208	5102

40987	7590	07/20/2006

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 11 and 17 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 11

and 17 have been amended.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

05/01/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 4 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: the word

"on" is lacking between the words "based" and "said" found in line 6 of the claims.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chen et al. (2002/0010000) in view of Tso et al. (6,385,602) and in

further view of Jeffrey et al. (2002/0083090).

As to claims 1, 7 and 11, Chen et al. teach:

providing an audible prompt through a speech user interface, said audible prompt

instructing a user to provide a speech input designating a search topic (prompting the

user for a speech input with a search topic, page 5, paragraphs 64-65);

converting said user-provided speech input, into a computer-readable text

representation of a topic-indicating phrase corresponding to said search topic and

comprising at least one distinct word (parsing the input speech into a computer readable

form to find the search term, the input is parsed into "find me a %restaurant," where the term restaurant is the search term, page 5, paragraph 64);

selecting items from at least one database based on said topic-indicating phrase corresponding to said search topic (selecting items from the database to search, the items being types of restaurants Chinese, Japanese, and Mexican restaurants, page 5, paragraph 64);

audibly presenting each group label through said speech user interface (presenting the group labels audibly to the user, paragraph 65); and

responsive to a selection of one of said audibly presented group labels, presenting through said speech user interface items in a group corresponding to said selected group label (when a group is affirmed by the user, information related to the group is presented to the user through the speech user interface, page 5, paragraph 67).

Chen et al. do not teach:

said selected items comprising other similarly and dissimilarly spelled distinct words having a predetermined association with said search topic;

dynamically grouping said selected items in a list corresponding to said search topic; nor

labeling each group of said selected items with a corresponding search topic label.

However, Tso et al. teach:

dynamically grouping said selected items in a list corresponding to said search topic (dynamically determining the categories and placing the data into the specific categories, col. 4, lines 15-20 and 42-50); and

labeling each group of said selected items with a corresponding search topic label (for presenting the groups, the categories are indicated by a test string, col. 6, lines 54-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et al. to provide a large amount of information to the user in a compressed list, as taught by Tso et al. (col. 2, lines 37-50).

Chen et al. and Tso et al. do not teach said selected items comprising other similarly and dissimilarly spelled distinct words having a predetermined association with said search topic.

However, Jeffrey et al. teach expanding the search topic by using word variants, including spelling (page 5, paragraph 44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et al. and with the query expansion of Jeffrey et al. to increase the maximum number of documents found by the search that relate to the search topic, as taught by Jeffrey et al. (page 5, paragraph 43).

As to claims 2, 8 and 12, Chen et al. do not teach:

parsing a list of items into component symbols;

identifying among said parsed items sequentially positioned component symbols

which are common as between at least two of said items; nor,

associating in a group said at least two items having said identified component

symbols in common.

However, Tso et al. teach determining similarity for the search results that

indicates the occurrence of the common attribute values among the qualifying data

items, the search results are grouped based upon the similarity data (page 5, lines 49-

59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et

al. to provide a large amount of information to the user in a compressed list, as taught

by Tso et al. (col. 2, lines 37-50).

As to claims 3 and 13, Chen et al. do not teach forming a label based on said

sequentially positioned component symbols which are common as between said at least

two of said items; nor, assigning said formed label to an association.

However, Tso et al. teach forming a label from similar words found within the

data, assigning an indicator based on the similar data (col. 6, lines 54-57 and 59-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et

al. to provide a large amount of information to the user in a compressed list, as taught

by Tso et al. (col. 2, lines 37-50).

     As to claim 17, Chen et al. teach:

     a data processing system (a wireless communication device to supply the user

information, page 2, paragraph 37);

     at least one database searchable by said data processor (database to be

searched, page 5, paragraph 67);

     a speech server in communication with data processing system for generating an

audible prompt that instructs a user to provide a speech input designating a search topic

(prompting the user for a speech input with a search topic, page 5, paragraphs 64-65);

     a compressed list processor in communication with said data processing system

(the user is supplied with a list of restaurants to choose from, page 5, paragraph 65);

     a selecting unit for selecting items from the at least one database based on the

designated search topic (selecting items from the database to search, the items being

types of restaurants Chinese, Japanese, and Mexican restaurants, page 5, paragraph

64);

     a presentation unit for supplying each group label to said speech server which

audibly presents each group label to a user and in response to said user selecting an

audibly presented group label, presents items in a group corresponding to said selected

group label (presenting the group labels audibly to the user, (paragraph 65) and when a

group is affirmed by the user, information related to the group is presented to the user

through the speech user interface, page 5, paragraph 67).

Chen et al. do not teach:

selected items comprising similarly and dissimilarly spelled distinct words having

a predetermined association with said topic;

a grouping unit for dynamically grouping said selected items in a list

corresponding to said search topic; nor,

a labeling unit for labeling each group of said selected items.

However, Tso et al. teach:

a grouping unit for dynamically grouping said selected items in a list

corresponding to said search topic; (dynamically determining the categories and placing

the data into the specific categories, col. 4, lines 15-20 and 42-50); and

a labeling unit for labeling each group of said selected items (for presenting the

groups, the categories are indicated by a test string, col. 6, lines 54-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et

al. to provide a large amount of information to the user in a compressed list, as taught

by Tso et al. (col. 2, lines 37-50).

Chen et al. and Tso et al. do not teach selected items comprising similarly and

dissimilarly spelled distinct words having a predetermined association with said topic.

However, Jeffrey et al. teach expanding the search topic by using word variants,

including spelling (page 5, paragraph 44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et al. and with the query expansion of Jeffrey et al. to increase the maximum number of documents found by the search that relate to the search topic, as taught by Jeffrey et al. (page 5, paragraph 43).

7.   Claims 4-6, 9-10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Tso et al. and in further view of Jeffrey et al. as applied to claims 1, 7 and 11 above, and further in view of Pitt et al. (An Improved Auditory Interface for the Exploration of Lists).

As to claims 4, 9 and 14, Chen et al., Tso et al., and Jeffrey et al. do not teach:

sorting said list alphabetically based on initial symbols in said list; further sorting said list alphabetically based on subsequent sequentially encountered symbols in said items in said list; nor, forming groups based said initial and subsequent encountered symbols in said items in said list which are common as between at least two of said items.

However, Pitt et al. teach sorting the filenames alpha-numerically (col. 2, page 56) and further sorting the filenames into those which have purely alphabetical extensions, those with numerical extensions, and those with alpha-numeric extensions (col. 2, page 56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et al. and with the query expansion of Jeffrey et al. and with the sorting of Pitt et al. to improve the speed in which users are able to perform specific tasks using the program, as taught by Pitt et al. (col. 1, page 51).

As to claims 5 and 15, Chen et al., Tso et al., and Jeffrey et al. do not teach ignoring article symbols when performing said sorting steps.

However, Pitt et al. teach sorting the filenames based on a determined character string length, then similar strings are grouped, (col. 2, page 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that as the filenames are parsed into the determined lengths, articles symbols would be ignored, given that filenames are only grouped based on the comparison of the parsed strings.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et al. and with the query expansion of Jeffrey et al. and with the sorting of Pitt et al. to improve the speed in which users are able to perform specific tasks using the program, as taught by Pitt et al. (col. 1, page 51).

As to claims 6 and 16, Chen et al., Tso et al., and Jeffrey et al. do not teach the step of forming a label comprising said initial and subsequent sequentially encountered

symbols in said items in said list, which are common as between at least two of said items.

However, Pitt et al. teach sorting the filenames based on the symbols encountered, such as the filenames sharing the character string, "SORT" are all placed within that group, (col. 2, page 56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et al. and with the query expansion of Jeffrey et al. and with the sorting of Pitt et al. to improve the speed in which users are able to perform specific tasks using the program, as taught by Pitt et al. (col. 1, page 51).

As to claim 10, Chen et al., Tso et al., and Jeffrey et al. do not teach a symbol exclusion component for preventing said sorter from considering selected symbols when sorting a list of items.

However, Pitt et al. teach sorting the filenames based on a determined character string length, then similar strings are grouped, (col. 2, page 56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that as the filenames are parsed into the determined lengths, articles symbols would be ignored, given that filenames are only grouped based on the comparison of the parsed strings.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to combine the methods of Chen et al. with the grouping of Tso et al. and with the query expansion of Jeffrey et al. and with the sorting of Pitt et al. to

improve the speed in which users are able to perform specific tasks using the program,

as taught by Pitt et al. (col. 1, page 51).

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is

(571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TS
7/12/06

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER